Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/056,454	COOKE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David T. Fox	1638	

All Participants:

(1) *David T. Fox*.

(2) *Erich E. Veitenheimer*.

Status of Application: *notice of appeal filed*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *21 October 2004*

Time: _____

Type of Interview:
- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
none

Claims discussed:
35,55,57,59,61

Prior art documents discussed:
none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated that Applicant had timely submitted Amendment after final and Notice of Appeal on 17 June 2004, but that these papers were only forwarded to the Examiner on 21 October 2004. Examiner indicated that the delay in prosecution was due to Patent Office error. Examiner indicated that the amendment of 17 June 2004 had been entered. Minor typographical errors were corrected by Examiner's amendment approved by Applicant's representative..